

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

is intended to be complete for editions of the *Primera Parte,* or at least down to the nineteenth century, and includes foreign editions as well as those of Spain. I may point out that the following editions given by Salvá in his *Catálogo* (II, 172) are not included in Blanchard-Demouge's list: Lisbon, 1616; Barcelona, 1619; Gotha, 1805. Yet the edition of Barcelona 1619 is mentioned on p. xciii in another connection.

On the same page (xciii) the editress speaks of a particular edition of the *Segunda Parte,* Barcelona, 1619, which Wolf (*Studien,* 1859, p. 334, note 3) describes, but which she has sought in vain to discover, although she has had the librarians at Vienna and Munich hunting for it. If she scrutinized the words of Wolf with more care, she might have spared herself and the librarians some trouble. It is the edition of Cuenca 1619, not Barcelona, that he is describing the while, and it corresponds exactly to the edition of that place and date known to the editress.

The concluding list of *Documentos* (pp. 329–337) gives evidence of wide reading. It is to be regretted that here, as elsewhere, a lack of precision in reference is evidenced which would render it difficult to run down some of the works mentioned.[13]

story and the poems that accompany it. While speaking of *romances,* I ought not to pass entirely over that beginning "Ya te veo, Lorca mía,—la por mí tan deseada," which is inserted, not in the *Guerras civiles,* but in Canto XI of the epic on the city of Lorca (cf. p. xxiii). It has never been printed in any of the modern collections of *romances,* and offers interesting resemblances to some of the old ballads. Thus: "O Lorca, cuanto le cuestas—a este Reyno de Granada;" cf. no. 101 of Wolf's *Prim. y flor:* "¡O ciudad, cuánto me cuestas—por la gran desdicha mía!" One should compare also nos. 55 and 129 in the same collection. It is likely that Hita composed it himself, in spite of its apparent traditional ring.

[13] Many such inaccuracies have been noted in the course of this article. I must not fail to correct the statement (p. liv, l. 8) that the *Cancionero de romances* 'sin año' was *later* than 1550. It was, of course, *earlier* than 1550.—The quotations which the editress makes from the text of the *Guerras civiles,* on p. xxx, l. 25, xxxi, l. 3, and xxxi, l. 14, follow the Rivadeneyra version instead of her own!

To sum up, the inspiration of this reprint is most happy, and scholars have every reason to be grateful for a reproduction of the primitive text of the *Bandos de los Zegríes y Abencerrages.* The editress shows an original turn of thought, and acquaintance with many an unusual book. It is a pity that these qualities were not accompanied by greater accuracy and a more critical judgment. A scholarly account of the different versions of Ibn al-Khatîb's *al-ihâta,* and generous translations from it, would have been invaluable. As it is, even the text cannot be called definitive, and the conclusions arrived at in the *Introduction* will have to be sifted well before they can be accepted.

Nothing is said which would lead one to suppose that the editress contemplates reprinting also the *Segunda Parte* of Hita's *Guerras civiles.* It is greatly to be hoped that she will do so. The text of the Second Part has suffered, according to Menéndez y Pelayo (*Orígenes,* I, ccclxxxviii) even more than that of the First Part, in modern editions. The Second Part has never hit the popular fancy, like the first, and has been, in fact, unduly neglected. The present generation, with its fondness for the actual and its aversion to works of the imagination, ought to revel in Hita's vivid descriptions of the Moriscos at bay, and ought to esteem his sympathy, extraordinary at that date, for the defeated enemies of his race.

S. Griswold Morley.

*University of California.*

---

*The Cambridge History of English Literature.* Vol. XI: *The Period of the French Revolution.* New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1914.

The characteristics of earlier volumes of this work reappear in the latest instalment. There is the same lack of complete co-ordination and proportion that one has been led to expect and that is, perhaps, the inevitable result of works

of joint authorship. In the past volumes single chapters have stood out as conspicuously good —"The Arthurian Legend" by Lewis Jones in Vol. I, "Spenser" by Mr. Courthope in Vol. III, "Dryden" by Dr. Ward in Vol. VIII, and the like. But too often the impression has been made that the assignment was given to him who was willing to undertake it. Especially is it to be regretted that one such person undertook the treatment of Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Milton, besides a host of minor subjects. These qualities are conspicuous in the new volume. That it should include works ranging in date and subject from Burke's *Philosophic Inquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* to Lewis Carroll's *Sylvie and Bruno,* and should group them under the general title, "The Period of the French Revolution," is an example of the difficulties which beset the editors. Moreover, the lack of editorial synthesis results in there being no discussion of the general influence of revolutionary thought upon English literature nor is there discoverable any reference to the volumes by Dowden and Hancock on that subject. It is hard to accept an arrangement that divorces Wordsworth and Coleridge from Byron, Shelley, and Keats. William Cobbett, though he finds place here, belongs to a later age; Mr. Chesterton in his clever erratic little book on *The Victorian Age in Literature* begins with Cobbett. This sounds like a Chestertonian paradox since he died in 1835, but it is fundamentally sound, for Cobbett is essentially Victorian.

The merits of this volume, as of its fellows, lie in certain individual chapters, especially H. J. C. Grierson on Burke, H. V. Routh on the Georgian drama, and H. G. Aldis on "Book Production and Distribution 1625–1800." Equality of merit is not to be expected, but the various contributions should have been constructed along definite and similar lines. A comparison of Schelling's and Whibley's chapters on the Restoration Drama in Vol. VIII—the one labored, scientific, "documented," the other appreciative and stylistically of course preferable —illustrates this defect. So here, side by side with Routh's exact and elaborate study of the drama, is Saintsbury's invertebrate (the word is his own criticism of his method; see Vol. V, p. 238) discussion of the parallel period of the novel.

Several chapters are in the nature of serials, further instalments on subjects connected with earlier matters already treated of by the same writers. Thus Previté-Orton continues from Vols. VIII and X his study of political satire and other literature connected with public affairs—a theme for the handling of which he proved his competence in his prize essay of 1908. He writes with wit and learning, and makes the dry bones of the most ephemeral branch of literature take on at least a semblance of life. He does not make plain the debt of Godwin to Rousseau, Condorcet, and Helvétius. Paul Elsner's monograph, *Shelley's Abhängigkeit von William Godwin's "Political Justice,"* though of interest primarily to the student of Shelley, contains much of value for the study of Godwin and should have found place in the bibliography. It is noteworthy that an edition of *The Rolliad* for which Courthope asked ten years ago (*Hist. Eng. Poetry,* V, 244) is still wanting.

Professor Sorley, continuing his account of English philosophy, is clear and reasonably concise in his treatment of Bentham and his school, but it is at least open to question whether such writers as Bentham should appear at all in a history of literature. "One fault of this history of literature," *The Contemporary Review* wisely remarks in a recent notice, "is that it has striven to be the history of English intellectualism."

T. F. Henderson's chapter on "Scottish Popular Poetry before Burns" in Vol. IX is now followed by his study of Burns and lesser Scottish verse. One turns with interest to this chapter by the co-editor of the edition of Burns memorable for the essay by W. E. Henley. Mr. Henderson was then a sort of "silent partner." He has now the opportunity to match his critical acumen with that of Mr. Henley. The fault of the latter's brilliant essay, *Robert Burns: Life, Genius, Achievement,* was, as every one knows, that going to the opposite extreme from Carlyle (who does

not mention even Jean Armour), Henley laid too much stress upon the sensual side of Burns. Carlyle and Henley read together are mutually corrective and the composite picture, when allowance has been made for contradictions, is fairly accurate. Mr. Henderson, without the genius of his predecessors, but equally without Carlyle's transcendental bias and Henley's unhappily boisterous manner, has from the fulness of his knowledge of the subject written a charming essay. I note only one fault, but that is a grave one. Of Burns' life knowledge is assumed on the part of the reader; no biographical outline whatever is furnished. This is a great inconvenience in a work of reference and is another illustration of the lack of complete editorial supervision. To the bibliography should be added the convenient Cambridge *Burns* (Houghton, Mifflin), "drawn from Henley and Henderson." It is not usual to include poems on poets, but as Swinburne's *Burns: An Ode* (here styled "Poem on Burns") is mentioned, Mr. Watson's far finer poem *The Tomb of Burns* should not have been omitted. The three important poems in Wordsworth's *Memorials of a Tour in Scotland* are not mentioned.

A fourth "serial" is Saintsbury's account of English prosody, of which the present section deals with the eighteenth century and chiefly with theorists. Logically one would have expected some study of romantic innovations since the chief innovators, Coleridge and Blake, are discussed in this volume. But the subject is silently postponed for later treatment. The bibliography to this chapter unaccountably omits any list whatever of the eighteenth-century treatises referred to in the text, and as such titles are seldom given, and then not fully, in the text itself, the value of the chapter for purposes of reference is small.

In a chapter already mentioned Mr. Aldis continues from Vol. IV his account of the Book-trade. His study of a relatively unworked field forms one of the most interesting portions of the book.

For Grierson's chapter on Burke there can be nothing but praise; it is the ablest piece of work in the volume. In his bibliography it would have been well to include one or two of the numerous school editions of the speech *On Conciliation,* especially the excellent one by Professor Cook (Longmans).

One cannot but regret that the treatment of Wordsworth was assigned to a foreigner and not to such fellow-countrymen of the poet's as Bradley or Raleigh—men who have seen into the very heart of Wordsworth. But Professor Legouis' work on Wordsworth's youth is well known and proves his qualifications for his task. He is altogether admirable when discussing such matters as the contrast between the poet's actual childhood and his later doctrine of happiness as expressed in *The Prelude,* or in tracing after 1805, with the waning of Wordsworth's enthusiasms, the growth of his belief in the importance of the moral law. Legouis is less good on other topics. Especially to be deprecated is the opening statement that Wordsworth is to be classed among the sons of Rousseau. Rousseau was but one of many influences upon the poet. The true relationship between them is rather one of common descent. Legouis fails to make clear Wordsworth's debt to predecessors, especially Cowper, Thomson, Akenside, and Collins. There is no attempt to trace the fluctuations of Wordsworth's fame; nor to indicate the main current of his influence, as seen in Taylor, Aubrey de Vere, Arnold, and Mr. Watson; nor to describe his somewhat pallid but quite perceptible vogue upon the continent, particularly in France. The connection of his work with the Romantic philosophy of Germany is not considered. The following points are noteworthy in the bibliography: Page 450. The variant title-pages (London and Bristol) of the *Lyrical Ballads,* 1798, should have been noted. P. 452—Arnold's essay on Wordsworth dates from 1879; Bradley's essay is reprinted in his *Oxford Lectures on Poetry;* there is an English translation, 1887, by Lady Eastlake of Brandl's *Coleridge;* Alfred Austin's essay in *The Bridling of Pegasus* should be added.—P. 453. Add reference to Courthope, *Hist. Eng. Poetry* VI, chap. vii. In this list is the best place (since the volume has no preliminary general bibliography) for the rectification of the notable omission of Dowden's

*French Revolution and English Literature* and Hancock's *French Revolution and English Poets.* Knight is merely the editor of the *Wordsworthiana* of 1889, which is a selection from the *Transactions of the Wordsworth Society* and should have been classified thereunder.—P. 455. Add William Watson's *Wordsworth's Grave,* perhaps the best of all criticisms in verse.

Of the many excellent things that Professor Vaughan says in his chapter on Coleridge I shall note only his remarks on the subtlety of Coleridge's observation of natural phenomena. To an interesting instance of this attention has not, I think, been called. In the *Memoir* of Tennyson by his son it is recorded that about 1831 Tennyson "saw the moonlight reflected in a nightingale's eye, as she was singing in the hedgerow" (I, 79). With this compare the lines in *The Nightingale* (ll. 64–69):

> On moonlight bushes,
> Whose dewy leaflets are but half-disclosed,
> You may perchance behold them on the twigs,
> Their bright, bright eyes, their eyes both bright and full
> Glistening.

Strangely enough, Vaughan does not so much as hint that Coleridge ever wrote any dramas; yet *Revenge* and the translations from Schiller are not to be ignored. This omission, which might have been remedied by Professor Routh in the chapter on the drama, is, instead, awkwardly patched up by Routh in some notes inserted in the bibliography of Coleridge under the titles of the plays. No cross-reference in the text guides us to these perfunctory remarks. Several minor points may be noted. Where did Byron "avow" that the rhythm of *Christabel* served as the model for "the cancelled introduction of *The Siege of Corinth*"? (p. 141). The lines which Byron feared might be thought to be plagiarised from *Christabel* are 522–32, and Byron expressly told Coleridge that these were written before he had read *Christabel.* See *Letters and Journals,* ed. Prothero, III, 228 f. An unaccountable omission from the bibliography is J. L. Haney's *Bibliography of S. T. Coleridge,* 1903. Note also the serious printer's error of "William Wordsworth" for "Coleridge" as the running title of pages 457 and 459—a mistake that has caused confusion in the entries in the index.

Mr. Saintsbury is at his delightful best in his discussion of Southey. In his anxiety to be just to a great fame now somewhat faded he perhaps overpraises some of his work, notably *Wat Tyler.* He even hints at a desire to break a lance for the unhappy *Vision of Judgment.* There should have been some reference to *The Fall of Robespierre,* of which, though it is usually included among Coleridge's works, more than half is by Southey. A pleasant topic for investigation is suggested: the change in Southey's political and philosophical opinions as recorded in his writings—a matter of some moment, especially for the light it might cast on the parallel development in Wordsworth.

Mr. Routh takes up the subject of the drama about the point where Nettleton left it in Vol. X and has accomplished a careful piece of work. The treatment afforded Joanna Baillie is surely inadequate unless (what does not appear) her plays are to be considered further in the next volume. *De Montfort* is misdated (p. 303). The Kotzebuë-craze is almost ignored. This, too, has perhaps been left for the next volume, but its place is here since *The Rovers,* which is a parody of the *genre,* and the novel of the school of terror, which is a closely related type, are discussed. The influence of Kotzebuë upon Sheridan, though referred to in the bibliography, is overlooked in the text. Mr. Routh speaks of Jeremy Collier shaming "the theatre out of its chief source of amusement" (p. 312); but Collier's pamphlet was in fact only one sign, of which the change in the tone of plays was another, of a rise in the standard of public morals. To the bibliography under Holcroft (p. 502 or p. 506) should be added a reference to the series of contributions towards his bibliography that have been appearing lately in *Notes and Queries.* Under section iii (p. 494 f.) add a reference to the curious tract by John Styles: *Essay on the Character and Influence of the Stage on Morals and Happiness,* 1802. It is hard to see why Gay-

ley's *Plays of our Forefathers* should find place in a list of works on the Georgian Drama.

Writing on the novel from Amory to Peacock Mr. Saintsbury merely covers again part of the ground of his recent *English Novel.* Some of his readers will remember that at the end of his *Short History of French Literature* he employed again the closing passage of his article on the same subject in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* with the excuse that "a man cannot say exactly the same thing in two different sets of words so as to please himself or perhaps others." This is sound doctrine, and the editors might well have obtained from another hand an essay on the growth of the later novel.

In Mrs. Aldis' sprightly and interesting chapter on "The Bluestockings" a reference to Byron's *The Blues, a literary Eclogue* and Moore's *The M. P. or the Blue Stocking* would have been to the point. Mr. Harold Child's excellent chapters on Cowper and on Crabbe call for no comment beyond the adjective I have just used, except to say that to the books by Thomas Wright on Cowper should be added the *Life,* 1903. William Blake has become so highly specialized a subject that I do not feel qualified to speak of the chapter on him by J. P. R. Wallis except to say that I have found the analysis of the prophetic books of much value.

SAMUEL C. CHEW, JR.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

---

*Dat Narrenschyp* von HANS VAN GHETELEN. Herausgegeben von HERMAN BRANDES. Halle, Max Niemeyer, 1914. lxxix u. 576 S.

Der Bericht über die neunte Jahresversammlung des Vereins für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung im Mai 1883 enthält die Mitteilung, dass H. Brandes die Herausgabe des nd. Narrenschiffes vorbereite. Nun liegt diese Frucht 30jähriger Beschäftigung mit dem Gegenstande vor uns, ein stattlicher Band, der des Interesses sicher sein darf, und dem es zu gute gekommen ist, dass Brandes' Arbeiten in der Zwischenzeit z.T. einschlägige Fragen behandelten und so gleichsam als Vorarbeiten des vorliegenden Buches angesprochen werden können.

Das Ergebnis der Untersuchungen in Kap. II der Einleitung vorausnehmend, setzt B. auf den Titel den Namen Hans van Ghetelens, in dem er den nd. Bearbeiter gefunden zu haben glaubt. Hans van Ghetelen gab 1488 in der Lübecker Mohnkopfdruckerei die "Ewangelia" heraus. B. hält ihn für den Bearbeiter aller Veröffentlichungen dieser bedeutenden Werkstatt, verknüpft also seinen Namen mit den besten spätmittelniederdeutschen Erzeugnissen, wie "Reinke de Vos" und "Narrenschip" (NS.). Es ist möglich, dass B. Recht hat, aber zur vollen Gewissheit darüber, ob der Herausgeber der "Ewangelia" (und wohl der übrigen Erbauungsschriften der Mohnkopfoffizin) auch die nicht-theologischen Bücher des Verlags für den nd. Leser bearbeitete, bedarf es noch einer umfassenderen Untersuchung, als B. in der Einleitung geben konnte.

Das entscheidende Gewicht legt B. auf einige sprachliche Eigenheiten, die in allen Mohnkopfdrucken neben den gewöhnlichen nordnd. Formen auftauchen, freilich in verschiedenem Umfange (NS. hat z.B. *jo ne eme,* nicht *ju nu ome*). Es sind keineswegs in die Dichtung einschneidende, nicht einmal dialektisch ganz einheitliche Sprachmerkmale. Einzeln begegnet ein Teil auch in anderen Lübecker Texten. Der Rostocker Druck des NS. kann ohne Schwierigkeit einige derselben, z.B. *söven: seven,* umsetzen. Ihre Bedeutung darf nicht überschätzt werden. Solange nicht erwiesen ist, dass Bearbeiter und Drucker *eine* Person ist, können sie für die Verfasserfrage nicht in Betracht kommen, sie können durchaus auf die Druckerei zurückgehen. Man vergleiche, was B. selbst S. LXXIV zum Rostocker Druck ausführt. Auch sind diese Formen in dem ersten Buche (1487), das B. der neuen Werkstatt zuweist, einer Neuauflage (keiner Bearbeitung!) des Ghotanschen Gebetbuches von 1485 für Ghotans Schreibweise eingesetzt, woraus m.E. der Anteil der Druckerei an der charakteristischen Schreibung ziemlich deutlich hervorgeht. Ferner zeigen die bei Geffcken (Bildercatechismus I, 140 ff.) abgedruckten Stücke aus "Speygel der Dogede" (Gothan